

Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

Applicable Regulations

Regulations applicable to this program include the following:

(a) The regulations governing the Library Services and Construction Act Special Projects Grants to Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives Program in 34 CFR Part 772 (50 FR 33185).

(b) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 74, 75, 77, 78, and 79.

Intergovernmental Review

This program is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR Part 79. The objective of Executive Order 12372 is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism by relying on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

The Executive Order—

- Allows States, after consultation with local officials, to establish their own process for review of and comment on proposed Federal financial assistance;
- Increases Federal responsiveness to State and local officials by requiring Federal agencies to accommodate State and local views or explain why those views will not be accommodated; and
- Revokes OMB Circular A-95.

Transactions with nongovernmental entities, including State post-secondary educational institutions and federally recognized Indian tribal governments, are not covered by Executive Order 12372. Also excluded from coverage are research, development, or demonstration projects that do not have a unique geographic focus and are not directly relevant to the governmental responsibilities of a State or local government within that geographic area.

The State of Hawaii has established a process, has designated a single point of contact, and has selected this program for review.

Immediately upon receipt of this notice, applicants that are governmental entities, including local educational agencies, must contact Hawaii's single point of contact to find out about, and to comply with, the State's process under the Executive Order. This single point of contact for Hawaii is included in the application package for this program.

Any State process recommendation and other comments submitted by a State single point of contact and any comments from State, areawide,

regional, and local entities must be mailed or hand delivered by April 25, 1986 to the following address:

The Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, Room 4181, CFDA 84.163, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202. Proof of mailing will be determined on the same basis as applications.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE ABOVE ADDRESS IS NOT THE SAME ADDRESS AS THE ONE TO WHICH THE APPLICANT SUBMITS ITS COMPLETED APPLICATION. DO NOT SEND APPLICATIONS TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

APPLICATION FORMS: Application forms and program information packages are expected to be available by November 29, 1985. These may be obtained by writing to the Library Education, Research and Resources Branch, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 725, Brown Building, Washington, DC 20202-1630, Attention: LSCA Title IV.

FURTHER INFORMATION: For further information contact Frank A. Stevens, Chief, or Beth P. Fine, Education Program Specialist, Division of Library Programs, Library Education, Research and Resources Branch, Room 725, Brown Building, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202-1630. Telephone: (202) 254-5090.

PROGRAM AUTHORITY: (20 U.S.C. 351 *et seq.*).

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.163, Special Projects Grants to Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives Program)

Dated: October 29, 1985.

Chester E. Finn, Jr.,

Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement.

[FR Doc. 85-26123 Filed 10-31-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

National Petroleum Council; U.S. Petroleum Refining Coordinating Subcommittee on U.S. Petroleum Refining; Date Change for Meeting

The date and location of the October 31, 1985, eighth meeting of the Coordinating Subcommittee on U.S. Petroleum Refining has been changed. The new date and location should read: Thursday, November 14, 1985, starting at 1:00 p.m., in the Conroe Room of the Four Seasons Hotel, 1300 Lamar Street, Houston, Texas. Notice of this meeting first appeared in 50 FR 41562, Friday, October 11, 1985 (FR DOC 85-24434).

Issued at Washington, D.C., October 24, 1985.

Donald L. Bauer,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 85-26186 Filed 10-31-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

National Petroleum Council; Worldwide Refining Trends Task Group; Date Change for Meeting

The date and location of the November 7, 1985, seventh meeting of the Worldwide Refining Trends Task Group has been changed. The new date and location should read: Thursday, November 14, 1985, starting at 9:00 a.m., in the Conroe Room of the Four Seasons Hotel, Houston Center, 1300 Lamar Street, Houston, Texas. Notice of this meeting first appeared in 50 FR 42753, Tuesday, October 22, 1985 (FR DOC 85-25161 filed 10/21/85).

Issued at Washington, D.C., October 24, 1985.

Donald L. Bauer,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 85-26187 Filed 10-31-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Bonneville Power Administration

Usk Loop Project; Finding of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), DOE.

ACTION: Notice of finding of no significant impact for BPA's proposed Usk Loop Project.

SUMMARY: BPA proposes to construct a new 230-kV double-circuit wood pole transmission line between the existing Bell-Boundary No. 2 line and a proposed substation at Usk, Washington. The new Usk Substation will be located at the site of a new papermill that the Ponderay Newsprint Co. proposes to build. The proposed line would be about 5 miles long and of wood pole H-frame construction; it would loop one of the lines from the BPA transmission corridor about 5 miles into the new substation.

The proposal would provide power transmission for Pend Oreille County Public Utility District (PUD) resources to Usk in order that the PUD may serve increased loads on its system. These loads will be caused by the addition of the proposed papermill and associated increase in business and residential growth.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed newsprint mill consists of two separate operations: (1) A chip storage

and pulping facility and (2) a paper machine facility with paper finishing equipment. The PUD has indicated that it has sufficient resources to serve both its existing load and operations of the new mill. So long as the PUD serves the electrical needs of the newsprint mill with the PUD's own resources (which it has specifically dedicated to serving the mill), BPA resources will not be used to serve this load.

It is not expected that the PUD would ever ask BPA to serve the chip storage and pulping facility because (1) the PUD currently has enough resources to serve the load and (2) if it asked, the load would likely be a "new large single load" under Pacific Northwest Power Act 3(13), which means it would have to be served at the relatively high Pacific Northwest Power Act 7(f) rate (for example, the new resources rate). Therefore, it is most likely that the chip storage and pulping facility will be served by the PUD, adding no new demands on BPA's resources.

This transmission project is jointly proposed by BPA and the PUD; BPA would design, construct, and provide testing of the proposed double-circuit loop line. BPA would also provide relaying, controls, communication, and monitoring equipment associated with the two line terminals and transformer terminals at the proposed PUD Usk Substation. BPA work would be performed at PUD expense; final arrangements between BPA and the PUD will be made after this environmental finding.

The Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for this proposal (DOE/EA-0275) covers the transmission/substation facilities that would be constructed or modified by BPA and summarizes the effects of the papermill which are covered in the Washington State EIS. Transmission plans evaluated were: (a) A single-circuit line from BPA's Cusick Substation to the proposed Usk Substation, and (b) a double-circuit loop from the BPA Bell-Boundary No. 2 line to the proposed Usk Substation. Three route alternatives for the plans (one for Plan A and two for Plan B) were evaluated in the EA. The summary below of the reasons why the proposal will not have a significant impact on the human environment pertains to the two route alternatives associated with the double circuit loop (Plan B in the EA). Other alternatives considered were: (1) Other construction options and (2) no action. The other construction options consist of a 57-mile PUD transmission line from Boundary Dam or a 10-mile BPA transmission line from BPA's Sacheen Substation, with very extensive

expansion at Sacheen. These other alternatives were eliminated from further study because the increased reliability and the customer cost benefits derived from the two plans evaluated would not occur.

For further discussion of the need for the project, the proposal, scope of analysis, and the alternatives, see the EA.

Reasons impacts are not significant are presented below, with references to appropriate sections of the EA.

1. Short-Term Disturbance and Compaction in Agricultural Areas From Heavy Equipment Used To Build the Line

Disturbance of crops would be incidental because the line is scheduled to be built between September 1 and October 31, 1986, after most harvesting has been completed. Construction during these two months will minimize compaction and rutting by use of heavy equipment because only light precipitation is received in the county during the late summer and early fall. If soils are compacted and if requested by a property owner, BPA will arrange for a contractor or the farm operator to do the subsoiling. The farm operator will be contacted to determine her/his preferred methods. Restoration work will be done within 30 days after completion of work on each tract, unless a shorter period is required to prevent further damage or a longer period is required to avoid crop damage or unstable conditions. [4.2]

2. Land at the Base of H-Frame Structures Taken Out of Agricultural Production

This could be about 800 square feet per structure (worst case) and could provide an area for weed growth as well. The alternative traversing the greatest amount of cropland (B-1) would remove about 0.25 acres from production. This amounts to an insignificant loss considering the thousands of acres of arable land under production in the Cusick Flats area of the county [4.2].

3. Noxious Weeds Will Be Controlled

To mitigate any new infestation of weeds that may be caused by construction of the proposed line, BPA will take these actions as part of the proposed action: (1) Prior to construction, BPA will undertake a weed survey to determine whether noxious weeds are present in the impact area of the proposed line; (2) construction machinery will be washed before and after entering the construction zone under standard construction contract specifications to

prevent accidental infestation; (3) after construction, BPA will make a second survey to determine whether construction has caused or worsened any weed infestation; (4) in case BPA's actions have caused or worsened a noxious weed infestation, BPA will consult the local weed control district and landowners and adopt a plan to eradicate or control weeds; and (5) it is BPA's policy to cooperate with the local weed control district, landowners, and land managers over the life of the line to control noxious weed infestations.

4. Temporary Disturbance From Construction Activities

Construction activities will temporarily disturb residents of the area. Construction is not expected to exceed two months and would be similar to a small-scale logging operation or minor road work, which have already occurred in the area. Disturbances to the local population, therefore, are expected to be minor and short term. [4.3]

5. Addition of Visual Elements to the Landscape

Other than brief foreground viewing by travelers on Highways 20 and 211, each construction alternative would be visible only to a few residents in the area. In addition, the contrast between the structures and their background would be low and the scale of the structures consistent with nearby features. [4.4]

6. In Forested Areas, Removal of From 18 to 45 Acres of Trees From the Right-of-way, Taking Land out of Production for the Life of the Line

There is much forest cover in the general area; the amount removed by this project would be a very small portion of the total in the county (0.008 percent). [4.4]

7. Possible Archeological Finds Due to Proximity to Newsprint Mill Site, Where Numerous Camas Ovens Have Already Been Found

Because the proposal may have an effect on archeological resources, BPA will undertake an intensive cultural resources survey of the selected transmission corridor before construction begins. Any cultural properties located during the survey will be evaluated in consultation with the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for their significance and eligibility for inclusion in the *National Register of Historic Places*. BPA, in conjunction with the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic

Preservation, would develop appropriate mitigation measures to protect any properties found to be eligible for inclusion in the *National Register*. In the event that a cultural resource is newly identified, construction in the immediate vicinity will be stopped until all applicable consultation procedures protecting the integrity of the resource have occurred. [4.11]

Other resource areas not summarized above are those for which predicted impacts were readily identified as negligible or nonexistent; they are listed below with references to appropriate EA sections:

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Air Quality [4.1] | Water Resources [4.8] |
| Developed Land Use [4.3] | Social Impacts [4.10] |
| Recreation [4.5] | Economic Effects [4.9] |
| Fish and Wildlife [4.6] | Noise [4.27] |
| Electrical and Biological Effects [4.26] | |

The 100-year floodplain will be crossed; however, the 4-10 structures required will be placed in previously disturbed areas as much as possible and will be designed to withstand normal flooding, should it occur. Crossing this area is unavoidable because the power source is on the west side of the floodplain and the proposed substation is on the east side. Therefore, a determination has been made that there is no practicable alternative to construction within the floodplain and that the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to or within the floodplain.

Except at Calispell Creek, no wetlands as defined in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service classification will be crossed. Towers in stream-crossing areas will be placed to eliminate construction in the wetland.

Components of Wild and Scenic River, National Trail, and Wilderness Area systems are not present.

Related Documents

An environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed mill has been prepared by the State of Washington in compliance with the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and has been made available to federal and state agencies, as well as to the general public. Concurrently, actions to ensure consistency with federal and state requirements have been taken by the applicants. The state EIS covers the proposed mill construction and associated power requirements, focusing on the mill. Environmental impacts identified in the state EIS are summarized and incorporated by reference in BPA's EA.

Public Availability

Copies of this Finding will be mailed directly to interested parties and agencies. Copies of the EA, this Finding, and related documents are available upon request from the Environmental Manager or from the Upper Columbia Area Engineer, at the addresses below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Environmental Manager, Bonneville Power Administration, P.O. Box 3621-SJ, Portland, Oregon 97208, telephone (503) 230-5136; or Area Engineer, Bonneville Power Administration, Upper Columbia Area Office, West 920 Riverside Avenue, Spokane, Washington 99201.

Determination

On the basis of the information in the Environmental Assessment and related studies, the Department of Energy finds that the proposed project is not a major federal action significantly affecting the human environment in the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 USC 4321 *et seq.* Therefore, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

Issued in Washington, DC, October 22, 1985.

William A. Vaughan,

Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety, and Health.

[FR Doc. 85-26077 Filed 10-31-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Economic Regulatory Administration

[Docket No. ERA-FC-85-034; OFP Case No. 64012-9295-20-24]

Acceptance of Petition for Exemption and Availability of Certification by Klondike Equity Enterprises, Inc.

AGENCY: Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Acceptance of Petition for Exemption and Availability of Certification by Klondike Equity Enterprises, Inc.

SUMMARY: On September 30, 1985, Klondike Equity Enterprises, Inc. (KEE), filed a petition with the Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) of the Department of Energy (DOE) requesting a permanent cogeneration exemption for a proposed electric powerplant to be located at its Klondike I (b) facility in Oceanside, California, from the prohibitions of Title II of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.*) ("FUA" or "the Act"). Title II of FUA prohibits both the use of petroleum and natural gas as a primary energy source in any new powerplant and the construction of any

such facility without the capability to use an alternate fuel as a primary energy source. Final rules setting forth criteria and procedures for petitioning for exemptions from the prohibitions of Title II of FUA are found in 10 CFR Parts 500, 501, and 503. Final rules governing the cogeneration exemption were revised on June 25, 1982 (47 FR 29209, July 6, 1982), and are found at 10 CFR 503.37.

The proposed powerplant for which the petition was filed is an approximately 27.6 MW (net) cogeneration facility consisting of a gas turbine and generator, a heat recovery steam generator, a steam turbine and generator, an absorption refrigerator package, and ancillary equipment.

The plant will be constructed at a facility consisting of two ice rinks, a healthclub, swimming pool, and restaurant. The plant will burn natural gas. It is expected that more than 50 percent of the net annual electric power produced by KEE will be sold to San Diego Gas & Electric, making the cogeneration facility an electric powerplant pursuant to the definitions contained in 10 CFR 500.2. The facility will also produce thermal energy for an absorption refrigeration system, water heating, and comfort heating system at the adjoining recreational complex.

ERA has determined that the petition appears to include sufficient evidence to support an ERA determination on the exemption request and it is therefore accepted pursuant to 10 CFR 501.3. A review of the petition is provided in the "SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION" section below.

As provided for in sections 701 (c) and (d) of FUA and 10 CFR 501.31 and 501.33, interested persons are invited to submit written comments in regard to this petition and any interested person may submit a written request that ERA convene a public hearing.

The public file containing a copy of this Notice of Acceptance and Availability of Certification as well as other documents and supporting materials on this proceeding is available upon request through DOE, Freedom of Information Reading Room, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 1E-190, Washington, D.C. 20585, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

ERA will issue a final order granting or denying the petition for exemption from the prohibitions of the Act within six months after the end of the period for public comment and hearing, unless ERA extends such period. Notice of any such extension, together with a